UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/614,261	07/07/2003	John Taboada	382/103	7790
Dr. John Taboa	7590 11/25/200 da	8	EXAM	INER
12530 Elm Cou San Antonio, T				
San Amomo, 12	A 76230		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2629	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			11/25/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/614,261	TABOADA, JOHN	
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Michael Pervan	2629	
The MAILING DATE of this communication Period for Reply	on appears on the cover sheet w	ith the correspondence address	
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR F WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILIN - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 of after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communicati - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	NG DATE OF THIS COMMUN CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a on. period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MO statute, cause the application to become A	CATION. reply be timely filed NTHS from the mailing date of this communicatio BANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).	
Status			
Responsive to communication(s) filed on 2a) This action is FINAL . 2b) Since this application is in condition for a closed in accordance with the practice ur	This action is non-final. Ilowance except for formal mat	·	s
Disposition of Claims			
4) Claim(s) 18-25 and 27-30 is/are pending 4a) Of the above claim(s) 18-25 is/are wit 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) Claim(s) 27-30 is/are rejected. 7) Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction a	hdrawn from consideration.		
_			
9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Exa 10) ☑ The drawing(s) filed on <u>07 July 2003</u> is/ar Applicant may not request that any objection is Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the off 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the second se	e: a)⊠ accepted or b)⊡ obje to the drawing(s) be held in abeya correction is required if the drawing	nce. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). g(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119			
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for for a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority docu 2. Certified copies of the priority docu 3. Copies of the certified copies of the application from the International E * See the attached detailed Office action for	ments have been received. ments have been received in a e priority documents have been Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	Application No n received in this National Stage	
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-94) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date	18) Paper No	Summary (PTO-413) (s)/Mail Date Informal Patent Application 	

Art Unit: 2629

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 27-30 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 3. Claims 27-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ivey et al (US 5,793,357) in view of Agilent Technologies Technical Data Sheet for the HDNS-2000 (as submitted by applicant) in view of Koizumi et al (US 5,883,616; as previously submitted by examiner) in view of Rallison et al (US 5,945,967; as previously submitted by examiner).

In regards to claim 27, Ivey discloses an apparatus for controlling a computer by tracking the motion of a body comprising:

- a. a laser (col. 4, lines 40-42; laser diode 2),
- b. a laser-speckle pattern generating means (col. 5, lines 28-40; speckle patterns are generated by simply having the laser reflect off of a surface.) projecting a laser-speckle pattern which moves in correspondence to the movement of the first rigid unit (col. 6, lines 1-11),

Art Unit: 2629

c. generating signals to control a computer.

Ivey does not disclose where said laser and said laser-speckle pattern generating means are combined as a first rigid unit and an optically-sensed digitally-autocorrelated navigation chip receiving means mounted on a second rigid unit for receiving said laser-speckle pattern.

Agilent discloses an optically-sensed digitally-autocorrelated navigation chip receiving means for receiving the laser-speckle pattern (HDSN-2000).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Ivey with the teachings of Agilent, an optically-sensed digitally-autocorrelated navigation chip, because it would give more accurate measurements of the movement of the pen.

Ivey and Agilent do not disclose where said laser and said laser-speckle pattern generating means are combined as a first rigid unit and a chip receiving means mounted on a second rigid unit for receiving said laser-speckle pattern.

Koizumi discloses a first and a second rigid unit (Fig. 1 and col. 3, lines 44-47).

It would have been obvious at the time of invention to modify Ivey and Agilent with the teachings of Koizumi, having light transmission from a first rigid unit and light receiving at a second rigid unit, because it allows the user to control a computer remotely giving the user freedom to move around and still accomplish a task.

Ivey, Agilent and Koizumi do not disclose where said laser and said laser-speckle pattern generating means are combined as a first rigid unit.

Rallison discloses where said laser and said laser-speckle pattern generating means are combined as a first rigid unit (Fig. 4A and col. 6, lines 15-44).

Art Unit: 2629

It would have been obvious at the time of invention to modify Ivey, Agilent and Koizumi with the teachings of Rallison, laser and diffuser combined to generate a speckle pattern, because it allows the speckle pattern to be generated anywhere and without the necessity of having a reflective surface.

In regards to claim 28, Ivey and Agilent disclose the apparatus of Claim 27 where said laser-speckle pattern is projected onto the optically-sensed digitally-autocorrelated navigation chip (col. 4, lines 40-42).

In regards to claim 29, Ivey and Agilent disclose the apparatus of Claim 28 where the output of said optically- sensed digitally-autocorrelated navigation chip communicates computer controlling signals to a computer indicative of the motion of the first rigid unit (col. 3, lines 1-11).

In regards to claim 30, Ivey and Agilent disclose the apparatus of Claim 27 where said first rigid unit may be rigidly attached to a further body thus enabling the computer registering of motion parameters of said further body (The first rigid unit (pen) is attached (held) to a further body (hand) and enables the computer to register movements of the further body (hand)).

Conclusion

Art Unit: 2629

4. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

5. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Michael Pervan whose telephone number is (571) 272-0910. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday between 8am - 5pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Amr Awad can be reached on (571) 272-7764. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2629

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

MVP

Nov. 20, 2008

/Amr Awad/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2629